

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### PAYING TRIBUTE TO MAPLE GROVE COLUMBINE CLUB

**HON. SCOTT MCINNIS**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2002

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an organization with a long history in Colorado. The Maple Grove Columbine Club in Montrose, Colorado has served as a social network for its members as they have come together to support each other, their community, and their country for nearly a century now. It is with is with great pride that I honor them today and share their heritage with my colleagues.

Since its inception as a women's social organization in 1911, the Columbine Club's activities have reflected the values that are at the heart of every American community. Established in an era when the horse was still the way to get around, the club traditionally has not held meetings during the summer months so the women could concentrate on preparing their children for school and canning their gardens' harvest for winter. Socially, the club held annual husband's banquets and Christmas parties to help bring people together, as well as regular meetings in members' homes. Their activities created lasting friendships as some members have contributed to the club for over 50 years.

The Columbine Club's activities reach beyond just social gatherings, as members met to discuss and undertake blood plasma donation during World War II and gathering goods to distribute to those in need. The club is indeed full of commitment and perspective with some members in their 80s still participating and supporting their community. It is good to see that the club is as full of vitality today as when it was first founded 91 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I stand today to honor this organization before this body of Congress and our nation. The strong values and social causes championed by the ladies of the Maple Grove Columbine Club reflect their commitment to their community, their state, and their country. I am glad to bring this group's history and accomplishments to the attention of this body.

### EXPRESSING SUPPORT OF OFFICIAL RECOGNITION FOR THE HEROES OF UNITED AIRLINES FLIGHT 93

**HON. MAC COLLINS**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2002

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I call to your attention a letter I received from David and Gretchen Nagy and Donald Evans, Jr., of Burke, Virginia. The letter, addressed to President George W. Bush, urges our government

to officially recognize the heroic men and women of United Airlines Flight 93 for their actions on the morning of September 11, 2001. These ordinary people aboard Flight 93 were thrown into an extraordinary and tragic situation. When their plane as hijacked by al-Qaeda terrorists, these brave souls made a choice to fight back against terror. The citizens on Flight 93 became soldiers, and in so doing denied the terrorists of their chosen target, perhaps saving our cherished Capitol from the same fate as the World Trade Center. Mr. Speaker, in support of this letter, I submit it for the RECORD. It reads as follows:

President GEORGE W. BUSH,  
The White House,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We write as ordinary citizens to ask that you lead our nation in bestowing some measure of official honor upon a tiny band of extraordinary citizens—the ones who stood up and charged the hijackers of UAL Flight 93 over Pennsylvania on 9/11.

There seems little doubt that these heroes spared America another devastating blow with their magnificent stand, possibly even a blow to the Capitol or the White House itself. Thanks to you and others, everyone now knows their rallying cry, "Let's roll!" Surely, everyone with a heart shivered when they heard it, and the story behind it.

And now, Mr. President, how many even remember their names?

According to press reports, they were Todd Beamer, Jeremy Glick, Mark Bingham and Lou Nacker—ordinary yet rare men with the guts to act when most would be paralyzed by fear. Perhaps investigators have identified others who joined their uprising. If so, they remain anonymous and unacknowledged. All the sadder.

In a sense, sir, weren't these men the first combat casualties in our new war against terrorism? The first to go hand-to-hand—and unarmed—against our attackers? They knew they were doomed. ("I'm not going to get out of this," Beamer told a cellphone operator.) They could have curled up and gone passively. But they also knew they could thwart evil and spare many on the ground if they went down fighting.

We respectfully suggest, Mr. President, that valor of this sort is in the grandest traditions of American heroism—something very special, on the order of that which gains our military heroes the Medal of Honor. Yet if anyone has proposed that this Nation extend these men some tangible form of gratitude, something solid their loved ones could touch and treasure, we haven't heard of it. So we are asking you, sir, to consider bestowing such an honor at a fitting, proper ceremony. Perhaps the Presidential Medal of Freedom would be appropriate, perhaps some other award for ultimate service and valor.

We still hope we are merely adding our letter to a growing stack.

God bless you, Mr. President.

DAVID AND GRETCHEN

NAGY,

DONALD C. EVANS, JR.

### GIFTS FROM PRESCRIPTION DRUG MANUFACTURERS? GOOD FOR PATIENTS—OR CROSSING THE LINE?

**HON. DOUG BEREUTER**

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 9, 2002

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member wishes to commend to his colleagues an editorial from the October 5, 2002, edition of the Omaha World Herald, entitled "Plug the Flow of 'Incentives'." Gifts from drug companies do influence when and how much medicine is prescribed. This Member recognizes that physician-pharmaceutical interaction can produce some positive results, such as improved knowledge of treatment for complicated illnesses. However, interaction can also result in negative outcomes, such as increasing prescriptions for promoted drugs, while fewer generics are prescribed at no demonstrated advantage.

As we consider adding a prescription drug benefit to the Medicare program and begin to examine ways to control prescription drug costs in the Medicaid program, it seems to me, that we need to ask the following questions:

Are consumers obtaining good value for the resources expended on new pharmaceuticals?

Are new prescription drugs on the market better, safer, and more effective than older drugs that have been on the market for quite some time?

Does the Government have a role in determining more than simply the safety of new and established drugs?

If so, does that role include evaluating clinical efficacy, convenience, and cost-effectiveness compared to current products?

#### PLUG THE FLOW OF "INCENTIVES"

Pharmaceutical manufacturers have long realized that doctors are key to the health of their bottom lines. Now, using words like "fraud," the federal government has indicated it will try to shut off the flood of goodies that drug makers pour over the decision-makers who are in a position to prescribe their products.

Financial incentives to doctors, pharmacists or similar health care professionals given to induce them to prescribe or recommend particular drugs or to switch patients from one drug to another are common in the industry. But the practice could break federal fraud and abuse laws, according to officials at the Department of Health and Human Services. The department is planning to set standards that would ban such "incentives" for a wide range of medical, insurance and pharmacy workers who make drug decisions.

The most notable underlying problem is the high cost of many of the brand-name drugs that are pushed hardest by the drug companies. These drugs, many of them with equally effective, cheaper alternatives, are profit centers for pharmaceutical companies. That means the companies are happy to shell out for weekend trips, expensive meals or

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.